



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/823,500	04/12/2004	David Stebbins	44046.203.222.1	3271
Eric J. Snustad Fredrikson & Byron, P.A. Suite 4000 200 South Sixth Street Minneapolis, MN 55402-1425				
7590 02/13/2008			EXAMINER BAND, MICHAEL A	
			ART UNIT 1795	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/13/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Interview Summary

**Application No.**

10/823,500

**Applicant(s)**

STEBBINS ET AL.

**Examiner**

MICHAEL BAND

**Art Unit**

1795

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) MICHAEL BAND.(3) Kara Fairbairn.(2) Greg Mills.(4) John Dolan.

Date of Interview: 08 February 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative)

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-38.

Identification of prior art discussed: Sajoto et al (USPGPub 2002/0015855; Thach et al (US 6,659,331); Frahme (US 4,414,786); Wada (JP 11006049); Konuki (JP62202075).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed Sajoto et al regarding PVD/CVD liners/shields. Discussed Thach et al regarding distinction between mat and grain size. New art discussed: Frahme, Wada, and Konuki. Discussed case specifics regarding pliant, soft, non-rigid, mat, woven fibers. Examples in suggested for Specification such as pliant, soft, and non-rigid to clarify invention.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Michael Band/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1795

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an  
Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required